

of his relationship with the victim from his computer and from her email account. Notwithstanding his prior contact with law enforcement concerning this matter, he made arrangements to meet the victim several days after she turned 16 and was arrested in Ohio with the victim after being stopped by a police officer while driving in a closed metropolitan park. At that time, a stun gun, among other objects, was found in his vehicle.

The Court considered whether a release of the defendant on electronic monitoring with instructions that he have no further contact with the victim would be appropriate. However, in addition to the presumption set forth under the statute, the Court concludes that his behavior after having been confronted by the FBI suggests that he would not be amenable to supervisory conditions and that it would be practically impossible to prevent further contact between the defendant and the victim. Under all the circumstances, therefore, the Court concluded that he had not rebutted the presumption of detention and he was ordered detained.

The defendant was advised of his right to seek review of this decision by a United States District Judge pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §3145(b).

/s/ Terence P. Kemp
United States Magistrate Judge